

*CROBYLOPHORUS* KRØYER, 1852, AND *CROBYLOPHORUS CHIMAERAE* KRØYER, 1852 (CESTODA OR MONOGENEA, GYROCOTYLIDA): PROPOSED SUPPRESSION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.) 1790

By J. van der Land (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*)

The purpose of this application is to request the suppression of both the generic name *Crobylophorus* Krøyer, 1852, and the specific name *chimaerae* Krøyer, 1852 (published in the combination *Crobylophorus chimaerae*).

2. Diesing (1850, *Systema Helminthum* 1 : 408) described *Gyrocotyle rugosa* as a new genus and a new species, on the basis of one specimen from South Africa. He stated that he had an identical specimen from Valparaiso. The type specimen was apparently lost, but the specimen from Chile is still present in the Vienna museum.

3. Krøyer (1852, *Danmarks fiske* 3(2) : 813) described *Crobylophorus chimaerae*, as a new genus and a new species, on the basis of one specimen from Bergen. The type specimen may be present in the Copenhagen museum, but it cannot be selected from the several old specimens that are present, because of incomplete labelling. Two specimens in one tube have a label bearing Krøyer's name, but date and locality are lacking. Moreover one of these specimens belongs to another (undescribed) species. Krøyer's description clearly does not refer to the undescribed species.

4. Wagener (1852, *Arch. Anat. Phys. Wiss. Medicin* : 543-554, fig. 1-7) described *Amphiptyches urna*, as a new genus and a new species, on the basis of about 20 specimens from the Mediterranean (Nice). Three type specimens are still present in the Berlin museum. The lectotype, serially sectioned, is still in a good condition, but the two lectoparatypes, prepared as balsam whole-mounts, are badly distorted.

5. Krøyer (1853 : 1226-1227) stated: "Den af mig under Navnet *Crobylophorus Chimaera* karakteriserede Form blev, saavidt Slægten angaar, ganske kort efter Offentliggjørelsen af de "danske Fiskes" syvende Hæfte udførligt beskrevet og afbildet af R. G. Wegener efter et rigeligt i Middelhavet samlet Materiale. Jeg siger, saavidt Slægten angaar, thi, ligesom jeg betvivler Artsidentiteten af Middelhavets *Chimaera* med den, nordiske, saaledes mener jeg ogsaa at have Grund til at formode, at deres Parasiter ere forskjellige, skjøndt nærstaaende. *Amphiptyches urna* er det Navn, hvormed Wegener betegner den af ham beskrevne Form".

We may conclude from this that *Crobylophorus chimaerae* should have priority over *Amphiptyches urna* since the latter was published (very shortly) after the former. Krøyer supposed the two species to be different, but since then no investigator has ever claimed the northern and the mediterranean material to belong to different species.

6. Wagener in Diesing (1858) transferred his species *Amphiptyches urna* to the genus *Gyrocotyle* Diesing, 1850, simultaneously changing the specific name: *Gyrocotyle amphiptyches*.

7. Diesing (1859) synonymized *Crobylphorus chimaerae* with *Gyrocotyle amphiptyches* and since then the former name has been mentioned in the literature as a junior synonym only.

8. In spite of the fact that Wagener himself considered *Amphiptyches* to be a synonym of *Gyrocotyle*, at first most authors did not agree to this. At least 15 to 20 references can be given to papers published in the 19th century in which *Amphiptyches* was used as a separate genus. In the 20th century *Amphiptyches* was generally considered a synonym of *Gyrocotyle*. Recently Joyeux & Baer (1951, 1961) defined *Gyrocotyle* and *Amphiptyches* again as different genera. The present author is more inclined to consider *Amphiptyches* a subgenus only, but, anyhow, the name has come into use again.

9. The specific name *urna* has quite frequently been used in the binomina *Gyrocotyle urna* and *Amphiptyches urna* for the most common European representative. A list of references would include titles of more than 50 books and papers; because of the great scientific interest of the group, hundreds of pages have been dedicated to it. Besides those mentioned in paras. 3 and 6 above, no other names are available for this species.

The name *urna* has also occasionally been used for five or six other species of the genus *Gyrocotyle* s. lat., and for *Gyrocotylodes nybelini* Fuhrmann, 1931, i.e., for all known species of the Gyrocotylida, but the reason for this was nearly always that these species were not recognized as being different from *G. urna*. There is only one exception: Lynch (1945) used the name *Gyrocotyle urna* for some species, but not for the common European form, which he included in the species *Gyrocotyle fimbriata* Watson, 1911. He was only followed by Poljanski (1955). This single case of inconsistency in the use of the name *urna* was caused by a misinterpretation of the original description and by the fact that Lynch could only study material from the Pacific Ocean.

Difference of opinion about the identity of *Gyrocotyle urna* is in fact out of the question because of the adequate original description and the existence of type material.

10. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked, in the interests of stability of nomenclature:

- (1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the following names, for the purposes of the Law of Priority, but not for those of the Law of Homonymy:
  - (a) the generic name *Crobylphorus* Krøyer, 1852;
  - (b) the specific name *chimaerae* Krøyer, 1852, as published in the binomen *Crobylphorus chimaerae*;
- (2) to place the following generic names on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:
  - (a) *Gyrocotyle* Diesing, 1850 (gender: feminine), type-species by monotypy, *Gyrocotyle rugosa* Diesing, 1850;
  - (b) *Amphiptyches* Wagener, 1852 (gender: feminine), type-species by monotypy, *Amphiptyches urna* Wagener, 1852;
- (3) to place the following specific names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:

- (a) *rugosa* Diesing, 1850, as published in the binomen *Gyrocotyle rugosa* (type-species of *Gyrocotyle* Diesing, 1850);
- (b) *urna* Wagener, 1852, as published in the binomen *Amphiptyches urna* (type-species of *Amphiptyches* Wagener, 1852);
- (4) to place the generic name *Crobylophorus* Kroyer, 1852, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology;
- (5) to place the specific name *chimaerae* Kroyer, 1852, as published in the binomen *Crobylophorus chimaerae*, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology.